

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/736,191	12/15/2003	Robert A. Rowland III	17090.002001	4366
7590 04/07/2005			EXAMINER	
Jonathan P. Osha			GIBSON, ROY DEAN	
ROSENTHAL & OSHA L.L.P. Suite 2800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1221 McKinney			3739	
Houston, TX 77010			DATE MAILED: 04/07/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	_
	10/736,191	ROWLAND, ROBERT A.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	_
	Roy D. Gibson	3739	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with t	he correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30 will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS to cause the application to become ABANI	be timely filed  ) days will be considered timely. from the mailing date of this communication.  ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 D	ecember 2003.		
<u> </u>	s action is non-final.		
Since this application is in condition for allowal closed in accordance with the practice under E	nce except for formal matters	•	
Disposition of Claims			
<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-24 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) 12 is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or</li> </ul>	wn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc	epted or b) objected to by	he Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	- · · ·	• •	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Appl rity documents have been red u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ication No seived in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)	·		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Sum		
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) 🔲 Notice of Infor	ail Date nal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:		

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear what the "other device" is since none has been claimed or recited in the preamble of claim 8 or 13.

# Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-11, 16 and 18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Courtnage et al. (2002/0143373).

As to claim 1, Courtnage et al. disclose a method of treating infections comprising:

- (a) irradiating the suspected area with light from laser diodes or LEDs to cause a rapid temperature increase;
  - (b) discontinuing the irradiation; and
- (c) assessing the suspected area for occurrence of infection: see [0011], [0012], [0017] - [0023], [0042] - [0043] and [0052] - [0055].

Art Unit: 3739

As to claims 2-3, Courtnage et al. further disclose the heating is continued until a predetermined temperature is reached, sustained at the predetermined temperature for a period of time, prior to disconnecting the power source: see [0054-0055].

As to claims 4-6, the examiner maintains that it would have been inherent in the process for the operator or doctor to have a dialogue with the patient to determine his degree of discomfort, and act according as claimed.

As to claim 7, Courtnage et al. further disclose repeating steps (a) - (c) if the assessing suggests the treatment is further needed (inherent in the process: see [0054-0055)].

As to claims 8-11, 13, 14 and 16, Courtnage et al. further disclose an apparatus, comprising:

a heat transfer element having a surface (Figure 1, contact layer # 120) and a thermal energy source (laser diodes or LEDs) which is an integral part of the heat transfer element for altering its temperature as required and wherein the heat transfer element is configured to a shape of a target area (Figure 3 and [0042-0043)].

Further to claim 11, Courtnage et al. disclose a mechanism for thermographic recording of the treatment temperature: see [0038] and [0044].

Further to claim 13, Courtnage et al. disclose an input for sensing and reporting electromyographic data related to the treatment area: see [0038].

Further to claim 14, Courtnage et al. disclose an insulating element (layer 120) underlying the laser diode array: see [0036].

Further to claim 16, the examiner maintains that it would be inherent in the design of the heat source to be able to replace a laser diode, etc.

As to claims 18-24, Courtnage et al. further disclose a method for using an apparatus for inhibiting infections essentially as claimed above: see [0011], [0012], [0017] - [0023], [0042] - [0043] and [0052] - [0055].

Claims 1-10, 13-16, 18, 19, 21 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Augustine et al. (6,468,295).

As to claim 1, Augustine et al. disclose a method of treating infections comprising:

- (a) irradiating the suspected area with heat from a heating coil (51) to cause a rapid temperature increase;
  - (b) discontinuing the irradiation; and
- (c) assessing the suspected area for occurrence of infection (col. 1, lines 13-55, col. 4, lines 6-19, col. 4, line 61-col. 5, line 20).

As to claims 2-3, Augustine et al. further disclose the heating is continued until a predetermined temperature is reached, sustained at the predetermined temperature for a period of time, prior to disconnecting the power source (inherent in the process).

As to claims 4-6, the examiner maintains that it would have been inherent in the process for the operator or doctor to have a dialogue with the patient to determine his degree of discomfort, and act according as claimed.

Art Unit: 3739

As to claim 7, Augustine et al. further disclose repeating steps (a) - (c) if the assessing suggests the treatment is further needed (inherent in the process).

As to claims 8-10, Augustine et al. disclose an apparatus comprising a heat transfer element (encapsulant with a surface and with integral heating coil 51) and a thermal energy source (32 with heating coil 51) which alters the temperature of the heat transfer element, wherein the heat transfer element is configured to a shape to fit over the wound or target area (Figures 4, 8 and 9 and col. 4, lines 6-10 and col. 5, lines 3-20).

As to claim 13, Augustine et al. disclose a touch switch which with an input of pressure turns off the power to the coil (col. 5, lines 3-9).

As to claim 14, Augustine et al. disclose an insulating element (Figure 5, # 15 and col. 4, lines 20-31).

As to claim 15, Augustine et al. disclose a positioning element (Figure 6, # 34 and col. 4, lines 49-60).

As to claims 16, Augustine et al. disclose the thermal energy source (detachable heater 32) is separately replaceable (col. 4, lines 6-9).

As to claims 18, 19, 21, 23 and 24, Augustine et al. disclose a method for using an apparatus for inhibiting infection comprising essentially as claimed above (col. 1, lines 13-55, col. 4, lines 6-19, col. 4, line 61-col. 5, line 20).

# Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courtnage et al. In the embodiment of Figure 4, Courtnage et al. disclose a temperature sensor for measuring the temperature of the treatment area and for providing a signal to regulate the activity of the light source: see [0055]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to provide such a sensor with the configuration of Figure 1, to provide the same temperature feedback and control function.

### Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 17 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Danek (2002/0165529) discloses a method and apparatus for non-invasive energy delivery which anticipates claims 8, 10, 11 and 13-16; and Bell et

Art Unit: 3739

al. disclose a portable fluid therapy device which anticipates claims 8, 10, 11, and 13-16.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roy D. Gibson whose telephone number is 571-272-4767. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:30 am-4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda Dvorak can be reached on 571-272-4764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

> Roy D. Gibson Primary Examiner

oy D. Gilson

Art Unit 3739